REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are submitted in response to the Office Action of March 20, 2007 (hereinafter Office Action). As this response has been timely filed within the 3-month shortened statutory period, no fee is believed due. Nonetheless, the Examiner is expressly authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0951.

On the basis of new grounds of rejection, each of the pending claims was rejected in the Office Action. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 12, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2004/0125142 to Mock, *et al.* (hereinafter Mock). Claims 16 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,662,178 to Lee (hereinafter Lee). Claims 2, 4, 6, 9, 11, 13, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mock in view of U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2005/0251748 to Gusmorino, *et al.* (hereinafter Gusmorino).

Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 8, and 16 to further emphasize certain aspects of the invention. As discussed in the following section, the claim amendments are fully supported throughout the Specification. No new matter has been introduced through the claim amendments.

Aspects Of Applicants' Invention

Prior to addressing the newly-cited references, it may be useful to reiterate certain aspects of the invention. One embodiment of the invention, typified by amended Claim 1, is a method of arranging grammar files in a presentation list <u>in a callflow development graphical user interface</u>. (See, e.g., Specification, paragraph [0004], lines 1-3; see also paragraphs [0012]-[0018].)

The method can include receiving a callflow development system request to visually display in a callflow development graphical user interface the grammar files in

the presentation list. The method also can include sorting the grammar files based on a first criterion that assigns user-defined grammar files priority over built-in grammar files. The method further can include sorting the grammar files according to a second criterion.

The method can include simultaneously displaying user-defined grammar files and the built-in grammar files within the presentation list in such as manner as to visually distinguish each user-defined grammar file from each built-in grammar file. Specifically, according to the method, elements of the built-in grammar files and elements of the user-defined grammar files can be presented as a sequential list of elements, wherein elements of the user-defined grammar files are presented ahead of elements of the built-in grammar files. (See, e.g., Specification, paragraph [0016], especially lines 3-4.)

The Claims Define Over The References

As already noted, independent Claims 1 and 8 where each rejected as being anticipated by Mock. Independent Claim 16, as also noted, was rejected as being anticipated by Lee.

Mock is directed to a method for organizing "calendar events" associated with different users. Mock, more particularly, organizes and presents the calendar so as to give the "appearance of a single user calendar," which is displayed on an electronic device such as a personal computer or personal digital assistant. (See Mock, paragraph [0017].)

Mock does not distinguish between user-defined grammar files and built-in grammar files, let alone those of a callflow development system. Applicants respectfully submit that Mock does not perform any type of sorting that would create a visual distinction between user-defined grammar files and built-in grammar files of a callflow development system. Certainly, Mock does not provide any mechanism whereby user-defined grammar files are afforded a greater priority over built-in grammar files, as recited in amended Claims 1, 8, and 16.

Neither Mock's providing of different visual backgrounds for, or associating specific comments with, different users' calendar events indicates any type of priority among the calendar events. Distinguishing a reference user's calendar events from calendar events associated with other users simply does not prioritize, as that term is commonly understood, one calendar event from any other. Mock merely provides a mechanism by which calendar events associated with different users can be differentiated using "various visual attributes." (See Mock, paragraph [0017], lines 12-19.)

With Mock, a "reference user" can be selected. But Mock's selection of a reference user merely results in a suppression of "messages" and "associated comments" for each non-reference user's calendar events:

FIG. 12 is a second exemplary composite calendar 1200 of the present invention using the calendar events illustrated in FIGS. 2-5 with the display preference set to display only events in the Work category 208 as the reference category. In this example, Mother is selected as the reference user resulting in the Work category associations 612 being displayed on the first device 102. Whereas the composite calendar 1100 was restricted to display only events belonging to the Work category, the composite calendar 1200 is configured to display representations of all acquired in block 704. All four users are involved in the composite calendar 1200 who are distinguished by having a different visual attribute: Mother having a first background 1102, Father having a second background 1104, Daughter having a third background 1106, and Son having a fourth background 1202. All events previously shown in the composite calendar 1100 are also shown in the composite calendar 1200 using the same display preferences applied in the composite calendar 1100. In the composite calendar 1200, any calendar event not belonging to the reference category, Work 208, is represented by

its associated category. For example, Mother's tennis message 218) with a comment 212 is represented as Self 1204, its associated category. Similarly, all her non-Work events 224, 226, and 228 are represented by their associated categories 1206, 1208, and 1210, respectively. Except for the 4:00 p.m. event 312 for which the previous display preference is applied, all Father's events, 228, 304, 306, 308, and 310 are similarly represented by their associated categories, 1210, 1212, 1214, 1216, and 1218, respectively. Except for her Work event 410, all Daughter's events, 228, 404, and 406, are also represented by their associated categories, 1210, 1220, and 1222, respectively. All of Son's events, 228, 504, and 506 are represented by their associated categories, 1210, 1224, and 1226, respectively. Multiple event entries within the same time period are organized according to the procedure outlined in FIG. 10. For example, at the 4:00 p.m. time period, each of the four users has a different event, and each of these events are shown as 1206, 312, 410, and 1224. Multiple equivalent events within the same time period belonging to the same category are also displayed according to the procedure outlined in FIG. 10. For example, on the composite calendar 1200, the event Movie 228, which--is placed on all the individual calendars 200,300,400 and 500 under the Family category 206, is labeled with the term Family 1210 with the number "4" 1228 representing the number of occurrences of this event among the individual calendars. Multiple equivalent events, such as Movie 228, may comprise a combination of unique visual attributes, such as colors and backgrounds, which indicates who the members of the equivalent event are. (Mock, paragraph [0032].)

Not Mock's selection of a reference user, Mock's suppression of messages and comments, or Mock's visually distinguishing calendar events associated with different users provides any mechanism for assigning a priority to different calendar events. Knowing that a calendar event is associated with a particular user does not give any indication of that calendar event's priority relative to any other calendar event; Mock does not prioritize calendar events in any meaningful sense of the term.

More fundamentally, Mock does not present calendar events in a manner that would provide a prioritization of user-defined grammars versus built-in grammars of a callflow development system. Specifically, Mock does not present elements of the built-in grammar files and elements of the user-defined grammar files as a sequential list of elements, as explicitly recited in amended Claims 1, 8, and 16. As illustrated in the cited figures in Mock, different users' calendar events are presented in a visual display wherein the different users' calendar events are interspersed with one another. The calendar events do not appear in a sequential list according to which user the different calendar events are associated.

Even more fundamentally, Mock does not present a sequential list of user-defined grammar elements and built-in grammar elements in a sequential list wherein elements of the user-defined grammar files are presented ahead of elements of the built-in grammar files, as further recited in amended Claims 1, 8, and 16.

With respect to Claim 16, specifically, Lee does not expressly or inherently teach every feature recited in the claim. For example, Claim 16, as amended, recites that a user-defined grammar file is simultaneously displayed with and visually distinguishable from a built-in grammar file. This feature and others recited in amended Claim 16 are not expressly or inherently taught by Lee.

Accordingly, both Mock and Lee fail to teach, expressly or inherently, every feature recited in Claims 1, 8, and 16, as amended. Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that Claims 1, 8, and 16 define over the prior art. Applicants further

10

respectfully submit that, whereas the remaining claims each depend from Claim 1, 8, or 16, these dependent claims likewise define over the prior art.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: **June 20, 2007**

Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577
Richard A. Hinson, Registration No. 47,562
AKERMAN SENTERFITT
Customer No. 40987
Post Office Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188
Telephone: (561) 653-500